

the FEC error correction. Referring to FIG. 1 and the text in Col. 5, lines 20-22 as specifically cited in the Final Office Action, the CRC unit 18 adds forward error correction data to the output data from the STDM 14. Notably, the CRC unit 18 is connected downstream from the buffers 12 and the STDM 14. As such, the forward error correction data added by the CRC unit 18 cannot be added to the buffers 12. Indeed, the design in FIG. 1 and other description in Schneider do not suggest any means for buffering the forward error correction data from the CRC unit 18 in the buffers 12. In fact, the cited portions in Schneider apparently teach away from the contention of the Final Office Action and suggest that the buffers 12 do not buffer the forward error correction data from the CRC unit 18.

For this reason, the cited portions in Schneider fail to provide the teaching to support the rejections made in the Final Office Action. Therefore, all claim rejections citing Schneider in various combinations with other cited prior art are improper under 35 USC 103(a) and must be withdrawn.

As to rejections to Claims 15 and 16 over Zehavi in view of Chou and Brown and rejections to Claim 17 over Zehavi in view of Chou and Brown in further view of Ayaanoglu, the Final Office Action fails to provide any showing of the motivation to make the combinations as contended. Under 35 USC 103(a), when a showing of such motivation or suggestion lacks, the rejections are improper and must be withdrawn.

Zehavi, Chou, Brown, and Ayaanoglu disclose very different systems and techniques. See FIGS. 1-3 and 6-10 in Zehavi, FIG. 1 in Chou, FIG. 1 in Brown, and FIGS. 1-4 in Ayaanoglu. The Final Office Action fails to provide any showing as to what motivation is made in these references to combine these very different techniques and systems. Applicant respectfully

requests the Patent Office to provide such showing in these references or supply additional evidence for such showing.

In addition, in order for a combination of two different references to be proper under 35 USC 103(a), the Patent Office must show that the suggested combination can be made with a reasonable expectation of success. Once again, the Final Office Action fails to provide any showing how these very different techniques and systems in the different cited references can be modified and combined as the suggested combinations and how the different features taken from different references to operate with one another in order to perform the specific methods claimed in Claims 15-17.

In view of the above lack of requisite showings under 35 USC 103(a), Claims 15-17 are patentable.

Therefore, all pending claims in this application are now patentable over the cited prior art on record.

A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) is filed concurrently with this response in order for the Patent Office to consider references in a new IDS filed herewith and to further consider the above arguments for the pending claims. Applicant believes that all pending claims are patentable over the references in the new IDS.